

42390P11991

**Request for extension of time**

Assignee herewith petitions the Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office to extend the time for response to the Office Action dated March 15, 2004 for 2 month(s) from June 15, 2004 to August 15, 2004. Please charge Deposit Account #50-0221 in the amount of \$420.00 for a two month extension to cover the cost of the extension.

**Remarks**

Reexamination and reconsideration of this application, as amended, is requested. Claims 1, 9, 10 and 13 have been amended, claims 5-8, 11, 12, 16 and 18-20 have been deleted, and claims 1-4, 9-10, 13-15 and 17 remain in the application. No new claims have been added.

**Support for Amendments**

Claims 1, 9, 10 and 13 have been amended and support for the amendments may be found at least in the embodiment shown in Applicants' FIGs. 3, 4 and 5.

**Response to the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) Rejection**

The Office Action rejects claims 1-3, 5, 6, 9-14 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Maloney et al. (US 5,956,219). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection in view of the amendments to these claims and the remarks that follow.

Applicants begin with claim 1. Claim 1 specifically recites:

An apparatus having an electrostatic discharge (ESD) device, the ESD device comprising:

a voltage divider to provide a first intermediate voltage potential;

a first current sink transistor;

a second current sink transistor coupled in series with the first current sink transistor and having a gate to receive the first intermediate voltage potential and a current carrying electrode to receive a ground voltage potential; and

42390P11991

a drive circuit to limit the first intermediate voltage potential to the gate of the second current sink transistor, wherein the drive circuit comprises an inverter with an input to receive the first intermediate voltage potential.

It is respectfully asserted that, as one example, Maloney et al. fails to meet either expressly or inherently the limitation that the Inverter in the first drive circuit receives the first intermediate voltage potential and the second current sink transistor has a gate to receive the first intermediate voltage potential.

As shown in figure 3 of Maloney et al., the inverter 344, 316 receives a voltage potential that is different than the gate voltage received by transistor 208. Also note in figure 4 that the voltage potential received by inverter 426 is different than the voltage potential received by transistor 406. Thus, Maloney et al. cannot anticipate Applicants' claim 1 and the corresponding dependent claims.

Claim 9 specifically recites:

An apparatus comprising:

a static random access memory; and

an integrated circuit, the integrated circuit having an electrostatic protection circuit comprising:

first and second transistors connected in series between a positive voltage supply and a ground potential, where a gate of the second transistor receives an intermediate voltage potential;

an RC timer to receive the intermediate voltage potential and generate a signal coupled to a gate of the first transistor; and

a drive circuit that includes an inverter to receive the intermediate voltage potential, where the inverter drives a pull down transistor to limit the intermediate voltage potential supplied to the gate of the second transistor.

With respect to claim 9, Applicants would like to kindly point out that Maloney teaches in figure 3 that an intermediate voltage potential 303 is

42390P11991

supplied to the gate of transistor 208, but that the inverter 344, 316 of the drive circuit does not receive the intermediate voltage potential as recited in Applicants' claim 9. Also, Maloney in figure 4 teaches different voltage potentials supplied to the inverter 426 of the drive circuit and the gate of the second transistor 406, which is in contrast to Applicants' claim 9. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 9 and its corresponding dependent claims cannot be anticipated by Maloney et al.

**Response to the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) Rejection**

The Office Action rejects claims 4, 7 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being anticipated by Maloney et al. (US 5,956,219). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection in view of the amendments to the base claims 1 and 9. Dependent claim 4 depends from base claim 1 and is believed to be allowable over the art of record for at least the same reasons as base claim 1. Claim 7 has been deleted by this amendment. Dependent claim 15 depends from base claim 9 and is believed to be allowable over the art of record for at least the same reasons as base claim 9.

**Response to the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) Rejection**

The Office Action rejects claims 8 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being anticipated by Maloney et al. (US 5,956,219). Applicants respectfully point out that this rejection is moot in view of claims 8 and 16 having been deleted by this amendment.

42390P11991

**Conclusion**

The foregoing is submitted as a full and complete response to the Office Action mailed March 15, 2004, and it is submitted that claims 1-4, 9-10, 13-15 and 17 are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the rejection is requested. Allowance of amended claims 1-4, 9-10, 13-15 and 17 is earnestly solicited.

Should it be determined that an additional fee is due under 37 CFR §§1.16 or 1.17, or any excess fee has been received, please charge that fee or credit the amount of overcharge to deposit account #50-0221.

If the Examiner believes that there are any informalities which can be corrected by an Examiner's amendment, a telephone call to the undersigned at (480) 715-5388 is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,  
Timothy J. Maloney et al.



Lanny L. Parker  
Patent Agent  
Reg. No. 44,281

c/o Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor & Zafman, LLP  
12400 Wilshire Blvd., Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026  
(503) 264-0967